

Date: Thu, 3 Feb 94 04:30:28 PST
From: Ham-Digital Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-digital@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Digital-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Digital@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Digital Digest V94 #24
To: Ham-Digital

Ham-Digital Digest Thu, 3 Feb 94 Volume 94 : Issue 24

Today's Topics:

 219 Committee Report
 ? how to learn about DSP ?
 KISS mode problems with Tiny 2 (DCD)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Digital@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Digital-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Digital Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-digital".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 2 Feb 94 22:04:08 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: 219 Committee Report
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

Well, I see that the ARRL committee has now decided what specific type
of networking is best for us, and seeks to codify it into law.

The band plan, as set forth, requires nothing less than 56kb, and because
of its bandwidth and explicit 'signalling rate' restrictions, prohibits
anything above 56kb. Looks like we're going to have a 56kb network, folks.
Hope that's fast enough for you, dude.

And get a load of the administrative requirements! For the first time,
NON-Repeater operations will have to apply for a COORDINATED SANCTION before
they can go on the air. There's a bunch of beaurocratic hoopage to jump
through before operation is to be permitted; it seems to me that this is
more in keeping with a fee-for-service commercial data highway than an
experimental radio service such as hams have traditionally been.

Couple that with the latest proposal that indemnifies ham frequency coordinating bodies from lawsuits and redress, and you've got the thin end of the wedge for sure. How long after this gets adopted do we wait for a proposal to allocate specific frequencies for, say, NTS Nets on 40 meters? What difference is there between that and what is proposed here?

Should we just let NABER handle the coordination?

We should see how this turns out in the NPRM, and be sure to comment upon it vigorously.

Brian Kantor WB6CYT UC San Diego brian@ucsd.edu

Date: Tue, 1 Feb 1994 18:38:11 GMT
From: darwin.sura.net!howland.reston.ans.net!usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!newncar!
uchinews!kimbark!khopper@seismo.css.gov
Subject: ? how to learn about DSP ?
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

How would a "novice" and aspiring DSP user learn about it ? Any good articles/books that you would recommend ?

Thanks and 73's

Ken Hopper, N9VV
HF biggot - PacTOR,RTTY,SSTV,CW

khopper@midway.uchicago.edu

```

|-----|
| o o  \_ /  o o |
| o o   @   o o |
|-----|

```

Date: Thu, 27 Jan 94 20:56:06 +1000
From: munnari.oz.au!metro!asstdc.scgt.oz.au!asstdc!active!cheese@uunet.uu.net
Subject: KISS mode problems with Tiny 2 (DCD)
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

In <2i5nhpINN9bo@bhars12c.bnr.co.uk> adsb@bnr.co.uk (Andrew Benham) writes:

>Incidently all the TNC-220 Pac-Comm code seems to lock up in KISS mode
>if data is received on the radio port whilst the TNC is doing the "LED
>dance" at power-up.

It's not just at power up -- the same thing happens when entering KISS from command mode. Once the LEDs have stopped flashing, there's no

problem.

--

***** Please note new address ---- *****

Mark Cheeseman cheese@active.asstdc.com.au Fido: 3:712/412.0 [+61 2 399 9268]
PO Box 199 Alexandria NSW 2015 Ph +61 2 353 0143 Fax +61 2 353 0720

End of Ham-Digital Digest V94 #24
